AMENDMENTS to the DRAWINGS

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

REMARKS

The Request for Continued Examination and Amendment are being filed in response to the decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (hereinafter "BPAI Decision"). It addresses outstanding rejections and objections of the last Office Action.

Objections to the Drawings

In the Decision by the BPAI Decision, the outstanding objections to the figures were not considered to be within the jurisdiction of the BPAI.

Regarding the objection to Figures 3 and 4 feature #609, we propose changing the notation in the icon to read "Parts Catalog <u>Database</u>". All disclosure paragraphs which refer to #609 to refer to a database.

Regarding the objection to an apparently incorrectly labeled feature #60 in both Figures 3 and 4, we propose changing the notation in the icon in Figure to read "SPS <u>Database</u>". We propose to amend all paragraphs referring to feature #60 appropriately. Item #60 was correctly described as the SPS database in paragraphs 0035, 0036, and 0037 as originally filed, so no new matter is added by way of this amendment.

Regarding the objection to Figure 3 regarding feature #62, we propose changing the notation in the icon to read "IOS ~~PS~~ <u>Database</u>". We are also amending paragraph 0034 to properly refer to a database with respect to #62. Item #62 was correctly described as the IOS database in paragraph 0027 as originally filed, so no new matter is added by way of this amendment.

Regarding the objection to the figures for failing to show the claimed feature "two readable repositories" (Claim 11), we propose to amend Claim 11 to clarify that the two readable repositories comprise a first database of the SPS (#60 of Figs. 3 and 4) and at least a second linked database such as the parts catalog (#609 of Figs. 3 and 4). All disclosure paragraphs which refer to #609 to refer to a database.

Regarding the objection to the figures for failing to show an "offer description creator" as recited in Claim 14, we have amended this language to refer to additional functional limitations of the synchronizer.

Regarding the objection to the figures for failing to show an "offer list creator" as recited in Claim 15, we have amended this language to refer to additional functional limitations of the synchronizer.

We respectfully request reconsideration of the objections in view of these changes to the figures and the claims.

Objections to the Specification

Regarding the objection to the specification for failing to provide antecedent basis for the term "repositories of information sets" as recited in Claim 1, we have removed this term and replaced it with "first database" and "second database, the former being associated with a Sales Preparation System, the latter being associated with a parts catalog, all of which is well supported verbatim in our disclosure.

Regarding the objection to the specification for failing to provide antecedent basis for the term "computer-readable repositories of descriptive data items" as recited in Claim 11, we have removed this term and replaced it with "first database" and "second database, the former being associated with a Sales Preparation System, the latter being associated with a parts catalog, all of which is well supported verbatim in our disclosure.

Regarding the objection to the specification for failing to provide antecedent basis for the term "offer description creator" as recited in Claim 14, we have removed this term.

Regarding the objection to the specification for failing to provide antecedent basis for the term "offer list creator" as recited in Claim 15, we have removed this term.

Claim Objections

Regarding the objection to Claim 1, the Examiner's suggestions have been adopted in the present amendment.

Regarding the objection to Claim 3, we are unable to locate the instance of "and" which is the subject of the objection.   We respectfully request reconsideration or clarification if possible.

Regarding the objection to Claim 6, the Examiner's suggestions have been adopted in the present amendment.

Regarding the objection to Claim 11, the Examiner's suggestions have been adopted in the present amendment.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

With regard to the rejections of claims 1 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. 5 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, the BPAI Decision has reversed these rejections.

With regard to the rejections of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 5 112, second paragraph, as indefinite, the BPAI Decision found that those skilled in the art would understand the claim language that required "dynamically linking said information sets and data items to said part numbers and said manufacturer identifiers for available products by executing a synchronization script or program", as well as would understand the meaning of contents of a Sales Preparation System.

Referring to Claims 5 and 10, the BPAI decision found that it is unclear "how saving a copy of set statically link the copy to the items".   We have cancelled these claims.

Regarding indefiniteness rejections of Claim 11 - 13, the BPAI decision reversed the rejections.

We believe that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 are now resolved, but if the Examine disagrees, we respectfully request suggestions for claim language from the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

The BPAI Decision affirmed the rejections over Perkowski. We respectfully maintain incorporate our arguments from the Appeal Brief into the present reply.

Regarding our argument concerning updating links in real-time or on-demand which was held not to be present in the claims, we ask the Examiner to consider our Abstract:

> . . . each time a trader requests current descriptive information
> about an available part number, the databases containing
> descriptive information are dynamically synchronized so as to link
> to the most recently available information, thereby providing
> the trader with the most current descriptive information
> automatically . . .

Very similar text is also presented in paragraph 0017 (as numbered in pre-grant publication). We also ask the Examiner to consider the conventional interpretation of our Figure 4 which includes a wait state #73 waiting for a request from a trader, as described in paragraph 0037. So, by "each time" we mean essentially "on demand" (or, perhaps more precisely "on request"). And, by "most current", we mean performing the steps in a manner which would not be slower than the rate of update of the information, such as faster than hourly or daily, as the case may be for each system design.

We have amended our claims to read "*each time* a request is received from a trader . . . " and dynamically linking "most recently available information". We respectfully ask the Examiner to reconsider this aspect of our claims, whereas we believe it is untaught by the cited references.

Regarding our argument of distinction that our process is automatic, whereas Perkowski's links are created by manual operations (e.g. drawing graphical boundaries around the content . . . with a mouse . . .), the BPAI agreed with the Examiner's holding that the present claims are not limited to automatic creation or updating of links. We have disclosed such automatic operation (Abstract, ¶0017, ¶0036, ¶0039), so we are amending the claims to specifically recite automatic

operation. We respectfully ask the Examiner to reconsider this aspect of our claims, whereas we believe it is untaught by the cited references.

Request for Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

We believe we have responded to all grounds of rejection and objection, but if the Examiner disagrees, we would appreciate the opportunity to supplement our reply.

We believe the present amendment places the claims in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, it is believed that the claims are not in a condition for allowance, we respectfully request constructive recommendations per MPEP 707.07(j) II which would place the claims in condition for allowance without need for further proceedings. We will respond promptly to any Examiner-initiated interviews or to consider any proposed examiner amendments.

Respectfully,

/ Robert Frantz /

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553
Agent for Applicant
Tel: (405) 812-5613
Franklin Gray Patents, LLC